

Ibid., paras. 73-87, and recommendation (para. 77), as well as paras. 424-425.
Ibid., paras. 93-99, and recommendation (para. 93).
Ibid., paras. 116-120, and recommendation XI (para. 120).
Ibid., paras. 121-129, and recommendation XI (para. 129).
Ibid., para. 130, and recommendation XII in the same paragraph.

A Difference in Powell, Dodd Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the editorial in the March 17 Peoria Journal Star seems to hit the nail on the head with respect to the two cases of Mr. Powell and Senator Dodd. I insert the editorial at this point:

A DIFFERENCE IN POWELL, DODD CASES

About the only thing that we feel can be responsibly said as yet about the Sen. Dodd inquiry, is that such an inquiry is proper, should be made, and the action decision thus based on the fullest possible information.

It will inevitably be compared with the Powell case, and at this point the only comparison available to date is that Dodd has submitted to the inquiry, has cooperated with it, has submitted to examination and answered questions about the minutest details of his financial operations—and that Powell did none of these things.

Dodd, in fact, accepts his responsibility to answer questions about his personal finances including outright gifts from private citizens.

The Powell case concerned only public funds, not his private sources of income; concerned substantially larger sums of money than any involved thus far in the Dodd case; and Powell refused to answer questions about the public moneys, and denied the right of fellow-Congressmen to take an interest in what he did with anybody's money—much less his own.

This dramatic difference has nothing whatever to do with the evidence of misconduct or no misconduct on the part of either, but it has a significance that may be even more serious so far as the progress of this nation socially in racial understanding is concerned.

The simple fact is that Dodd couldn't defy his fellows. He could not fall back on an appeal or a charge of race prejudice. Powell could and did.

The fact that Powell did this, and that such tactics had such a powerful appeal and support among Negroes is the most unfortunate result of the whole mess.

For the first time, many Americans shocked a recent years by the full realization that Negroes have been subjected to such race prejudice over a long period of time, are now being shocked by the evidences of intense race prejudice by Negroes directed against whites.

This is natural and understandable as a consequence of our history, but what grieves many of us is the fact that this understanding alone doesn't prevent the unhappy consequences.

While progress has been made to break down the barriers of white prejudice, new barriers seem to be in the process of creation through such evidences of Negro prejudice. It is hard to see how any real answer to

the common problem of all is going to come until there is a potent feeling against race prejudice, itself, wherever appealed to and whomever displays it—instead of a group that is only sensitive to "white prejudice" and another that is only sensitive to "Negro prejudice."

As long as the only and many citizens see or look to see is "white prejudice and discrimination," and another group only see or seek to see is "Negro prejudice and discriminatory demands for special treatment," the real evil is neglected.

The evil is racial prejudice and discrimination, wherever practiced. And attention to that evil, as such, is being neglected, by Negroes and whites alike where attention would do the most good—in our own actions and social contacts in our own groups, whatever they may happen to be.

Too much of the time we are fostering the evil of racial prejudice in our midst by the very means and methods with which we attack it in others.

And where can that possibly end? Only in greater evils than ever, and a dreary future in race relations that is the last thing any of us of any skin shade need.

Urban and Rural Poor

SPEECH

OF

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1967

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on one of the proposals in the message on urban and rural poor which the President sent to the Congress today.

This is the proposal that would lift the ceiling on the amount of insured loans that can be made for rural community water and sewer systems.

This is a step in the right direction.

There are thousands of rural communities that are standing still today because they lack a modern water system. There are thousands of rural communities today in which the health of the people is endangered because of a lack of a modern waste disposal system.

Far too many years we have turned our backs on our rural communities. As a result, all of the talented young people, all of the skilled people, and many of the unskilled, have left their home communities, their towns, and their villages and migrated to the urban centers.

Sometimes for the talented this has worked out well.

Usually for the unskilled it has meant a place on an urban welfare roll.

In all cases this migration has spelled disaster for rural America.

If we can equip our rural communities with modern water and sewer systems just as we equipped them with electricity we will soon have a renaissance in rural America.

Industries will be attracted to rural sites.

Young people will decide to make their living in the community they were born and raised in. A better balance will develop between our urban and rural areas.

This is a sound proposal, Mr. Speaker, and I want to commend the President

and the Secretary of Agriculture for making the recommendation to lift the ceiling on insured loans.

Russians Seen Urging on Viet Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1967

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, a recent article by David Lawrence, published in the Washington Star, gives a very good analysis as to why the Russians are not interested in establishing peace in Vietnam. His article follows:

RUSSIANS SEEN URGING ON VIET REDS

Perhaps the CIA hasn't on file the message that follows, but certainly an efficient intelligence agency in the midst of war must have an equivalent record of what the Soviet Union has recently been telling its vowed ally—the North Vietnamese government in Hanoi. If revealed, it doubtless would be discovered that the Russians had said:

"Keep on fighting. Keep on demanding peace, and be sure to insist that the Americans stop the bombing and send their troops back home. The United States government is getting discouraged. The people are divided. A few days ago 2,400 college professors issued a statement demanding that the bombing be stopped. Senator Robert Kennedy urges virtually the same thing and they say he is running for President and can defeat Johnson.

"Don't worry about your casualties. You are inflicting greater damage on South Vietnam and on the Americans. Your mortar fire is excellent, and don't worry if you kill civilians, too. The American's haven't been told much about this—they are being told instead that only their planes kill civilians.

"You can win the war. The Americans will sooner or later stop the bombing, and you, of course, will keep up your guerrilla fighting and terrorism. You don't have to agree to anything in advance to get the Americans to stop bombing.

"We know you need weapons and supplies, and we have sent you more in the first two months of this year than we did all last year—including larger mortars and rocket launchers. We're sending lots of it by ship, but most of it is going overland. The enemy will not dare to bomb us. They didn't bomb the supply lines north of the Yalu River in the Korean War, even though the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended it.

"The Americans will soon tire of the war and try to wiggle out somehow, but don't forget—your terms must be unconditional surrender. The United States is begging us for peace. It is even trying to butter us up by a new consular treaty that gives us a chance to put more of our agents in American cities. And now we seem to have the Senate on our side, as the members are openly saying they do not want to offend us.

"It's true Premier Kosygin talked peace when he was in London, but some of the other leaders in the Kremlin reprimanded him a bit when he got back. Anyway, he gave the Americans the impression that, if they curry favor with us, they'll be better off and that maybe we'll end the war in Vietnam. But we have told the world that we haven't a thing to do with your policies and that you make your own decisions. So we keep on urging the Americans to stop the bombing 'unconditionally and permanently.' We expect shortly more college professors in